



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,339	07/08/2003	Clement Robertson	60707-1360	7869
24504	7590	10/15/2008		
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTMEYER & RISLEY, LLP			EXAMINER	
600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E.			KANG, SUK JIN	
STE 1500				
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/614,339	Applicant(s) ROBERTSON, CLEMENT
	Examiner SUK JIN KANG	Art Unit 2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,7-12,18-23 and 29-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,7-12,18-23 and 29-39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 12, and 23 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6 and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,298,758 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application claims 1, 12 and 23 merely broaden the scope of the patented claims 6 and 16.

Consider claims 1, 12, and 23 of the application, Patent '758 discloses a method and system for optimizing cell available (CLAV) status polling of a plurality of physical interface addresses (claim 1 of Patent '758, "a method for optimizing cell available (CLAV) status polling"), the method comprising the steps of:

polling a plurality of PHY addresses to determine CLAV status (claim 1 of Patent '758, "polling the first and second associated set of PHY address to determine a CLAV status for each PHY address");

receiving the CLAV status for each one of the plurality of PHY addresses (claim 1 of Patent '758, "...determine a CLAV status of each PHY address..." and "determining whether each PHY address...requires polling", thus in determining the CLAV status of the PHY address the actual CLAV status would presumably be known and received);

determining whether the CLAV status could change for each PHY address, wherein the CLAV status that could change comprises both an inactive CLAV status and a completed cell transfer (claim 1 of Patent '758, "...determine a CLAV status of

each PHY address..." and "determining whether each PHY address...requires polling", thus in determining a CLAV status of the PHY address the actual CLAV status, whether inactivity, cell transfer completion, or status change, would presumably be known and determined); and

re-pollling each of the PHY addresses having a CLAV status that could change while avoiding re-pollling of PHY addresses having an active CLAV status (claim 6 of Patent '758, "PHY addresses with an active CLAV status that have not been serviced are not re-polled wherein bandwidth is conserved").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate not re-pollling physical addresses with active CLAV status in order to efficiently manage bandwidth as stated by claims 6 and 16 of the patent. See MPEP 804.01.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12, and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Suk Jin Kang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Chirag Shah can be reached on (571) 272-3144. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Suk Jin Kang/

Examiner, Art Unit 2619

October 9, 2008

/Chirag G Shah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419